

The University of Chicago

THE RISE AND DEVELOPMENT
OF LAY LEADERSHIP IN THE
LATTER-DAY SAINT
MOVEMENT

A PART OF A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF THE DIVINITY SCHOOL
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

1937

By
WESLEY P. LLOYD

Private Edition, Distributed by
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARIES
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

1939

The University of Chicago

**THE RISE AND DEVELOPMENT
OF LAY LEADERSHIP IN THE
LATTER-DAY SAINT
MOVEMENT**

**A PART OF A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF THE DIVINITY SCHOOL
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY**

1937

**By
WESLEY P. LLOYD**

**Private Edition, Distributed by
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARIES
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS**

1939



THE RISE AND DEVELOPMENT OF LAY LEADERSHIP
IN THE LATTER-DAY SAINT MOVEMENT
A SUMMARY

Church leadership in America is no longer a one-man job. The many-sided program which churches are conducting is in marked contrast to the relatively simple religious life of colonial times. This diversified program naturally places new emphasis upon individual initiative as well as upon group activity, and church officials in all denominations are looking increasingly for laymen with capacity for religious leadership.

In its program of leadership the Latter-day Saint movement has depended almost entirely upon its laymen. The first century of its history has passed with no attempt at the development of a professional ministry. This movement presents a fascinating background and a highly developed organization of laymen. It offers material for a significant study at the present time because of its demonstrated ability in bringing large numbers of people to positions of leadership and, at the same time, maintaining a unity and solidarity conducive to a centralized program.

The problem with which we are dealing grows out of a need for a better understanding of the real status of the laymen in the Latter-day Saint church. In attempting to analyze the problem of lay leadership in the Latter-day Saint society the writer has set himself the task of presenting an historical description of the rise and development of the phenomenon. Such a study lays a foundation for future investigation in the field of Mormon lay leadership and raises manifold issues and marginal problems for future study.

The term lay leadership, as used in this study, refers to any responsibility taken by a lay member in the interests of maintaining or promoting his religious order. Lay leaders, then, we shall regard as any individuals who, either with or without formal appointment, contribute time, money, talent or initiative for the development of the cause and who do not regard their church work as a formal vocation. This definition makes lay leadership closely

related to, although not identical with, religious individualism. Mormonism seems to have combined a highly authoritative pattern of church government with a concept of the religious freedom of the common man, and devised from this fusion a workable pattern of layman's responsibility. This development forms the central interest of our study.

There are few writers of Mormon history who have not oversimplified the central issues with which they have dealt. In the presence of the modern scientific approach to the history of religious movements no single-track explanations can be taken with any degree of seriousness. The social, psychological, biological and religious sciences have opened fields of information which give new meaning to movements which grow out of any religious experience; and new norms are arising for the recognition of so-called ultimates.

In treating our subject we are concerned not so much with the chronological sequence of events as with the development of ideas. Ideas and attitudes are not formed in a social vacuum but in the welter of life, and their growth usually comes in successive stages. Antecedent and consequent cannot be overlooked in the systematic development of a philosophy or an ideal. Although due attention has been given to the social and historical setting of Mormon lay leadership we make no pretense toward the view that all of the factors in our problem have been discovered. After the student has exhausted the common avenues of research and considered the known rules of social interaction he must allow for the working of the principle of spontaneity within each cause which keeps it from becoming pure mechanism with an easily predictable function.

Mormonism arose under unique conditions. It was subjected to influences peculiar to nineteenth-century America and is one of the few religious movements which was not transplanted from foreign soil. Its system of lay leadership reflects, in part, the spirit of American frontier individualism.

The present state of the development of Latter-day Saint lay leadership represents the growth of little more than a century. If future development persists in the direction of religious democracy this movement may write a new chapter in the history of religions.

In describing the rise and development of lay leadership

in the Latter-day Saint movement it is necessary to recognize the broad social, economic and religious background out of which the movement arose. Lay leadership is now so much a part of Mormonism that any significant issue relating to the Mormon movement is, in turn, significant to its leadership program.

It took the Protestant Reformation in Europe, the various dissenting elements of population both on the continent and in England, the growth of American individualism which culminated in the revolutionary war and the creation of a democratic political state, the dominating influence of the American frontier with its characteristic contributions to the new nation, the period of religious revivalism, the further struggle for democracy in the state of New York, and the restless state of the reforming period of the eighteen thirties and forties in America to create a background from which this system of lay leadership could develop. A carry-over of Old Testament and early Christian theology with its emphasis upon authority, combined with a new stress upon continuous revelation, was largely responsible for holding this lay movement within sufficient bounds to keep it from losing itself in diffused fields of action.

Primitive Christianity was largely a movement among laymen. It was officered by laymen and for a time maintained close contact with their problems. With the development of the ecclesiastical order there came into existence a class of professional religious workers in the Christian church. The Reformation and other dissenting movements were directed toward a return to a religious ideal in which the individual could feel a relationship between himself and his God without the intervention of an authoritative ecclesiastical order.

This expression of individualism, which seems to be an integral part of Christianity, is not to be interpreted as an anti-social individualism, but more as a tendency among Christians to exercise their own agency in the arrangement of a highly social and religious life. American Christianity breathed much of the spirit of this new individualism. And yet people did not feel as free in religion as they came to feel in politics. Having tasted political freedom through the medium of the Revolution and then realizing that religious ties with the old world had also been severed, the people of the new nation awakened to the fact that their independence was more than political. But religious inde-

pendence rarely meant the practice of lay leadership, since most American churches worked diligently to train their leaders in the ministry.¹

The philosophy of individualism which permeated the new nation was ideal ground for the development of the lay leader program. Added to this were such factors as the scarcity of trained ministers, the legal complications of the American state which brought laymen to positions of trusteeship over church property, the later rise of Sunday Schools, women's organizations, and the spread of missions.² These later movements not only provided for lay participation but showed its growing need in American life.

Among the denominations which early showed a high degree of lay responsibility the Methodists, Baptists, and Disciples are worthy of mention. Among the less populous groups the Quakers and the Moravians were highly lay active. The Disciples had a good deal in common with the Latter-day Saints on the Western Reserve and their organization shows similarities with as well as marked differences from the Latter-day Saint group. The Disciples made no sharp distinction between the clergy and the laity. They maintained the spirit of democracy by assiduously declaring that no man should be called priest. Mormonism, in the other hand, held the leaders and the people together by declaring that every man should be a priest.

Mormonism arose in a section of New York state where the issues of democracy had been brought vividly before the people through constant political and economic struggle. In 1830 central and western New York was typically frontier. We have said that Mormonism was nurtured under influences which were peculiar to nineteenth-century America. These influences are expressed largely in terms of the frontier. The present pattern of lay leadership among Latter-day Saints was largely influenced by a succession of frontier locations. Other religious groups which stressed some degree of lay leadership as a convenience of frontier life adjusted to systems of a trained ministry as they began

¹Wesley P. Lloyd, "The Rise and Development of Lay Leadership in the Latter-day Saint Movement" (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1937), pp. 18-19.

²Ibid., pp. 28-32.

moving in more settled areas.¹ Mormonism had no such opportunities. Through a process of group migration it moved from one frontier to another until finally, in its latest home, the forces of a more settled civilization overtook it. This situation made it possible for the pattern of lay leadership to become embedded in the group during a period covering three quarters of a century.

Constant religious revivals had swept the country so thoroughly by 1830 that the people were quite awake to the issues that dominated the religious world of that day. In the first half of the nineteenth century America was truly articulate. In no section was she more critically aware of issues than in central and western New York which was not only a battleground for political democracy but a hotbed of religious revivalism and a hatchery for almost any type of reform. Prominent among the topics of popular debate were temperance, communistic ideas, Adventism, and Indian origins. Out of this period came the only indigenous and typically American religions. Mormonism, deriving from these rich antecedents of American influence, is typical and perhaps the most expressive of its time. It found answers for vital questions of the day and found itself moving in fields which attracted thousands of followers in Europe as well as in America.

Beginnings of Latter-day Saint Lay Leadership

Laying claim to the title, "The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints," this religious movement has always exerted a powerful influence over its converts and has furnished a genuine religious driving power. This study does not attempt to show that in the growth of Mormonism the principle of religious democracy was nurtured without the influence of a governing priesthood. The very existence of a theological belief that the church presidency and apostles are prophets, seers and revelators, would seem, on the surface, to contradict any contention that real governing power could exist among the laity. The early period of Mormon church history demonstrates the way in which these two seemingly contradictory principles each acceded with good grace to the common weal and thus produced a new phenomenon in American religion.

¹The Baptists, Methodists and Disciples are good examples of this transition.

Building upon a belief in continuous revelation and identifying itself with the older religions of Israel and primitive Christianity, the Mormons presented a theology which was rich in its satisfying values. This theology was vitalized by the group experiences which brought the people into conflict with every other group which they met in both their temporary and permanent homes.

Latter-day Saint government was delegated to the people through the official confirmation of the priesthood upon every worthy adult. This priesthood was not to be an instrument in the hands of a hierarchy. Its function was not that of centralization of power in a few individuals, but a kind of decentralization in which each member felt that he had received the call to action, and could therefore act with a divine sanction equal to that enjoyed by any other holder of the priesthood. Neither the Catholic hierarchical priesthood nor the members of the select Protestant ministry felt any greater call than did the lay members of the Latter-day Saint group.

A belief in eternal progression, the commission to gather the tribes of Israel from the nations of the earth, and the call to prepare Zion for the Second Coming of Christ all had their effect in making the Saints an especially active and socially responsible rather than a passive and isolated group.¹ One of the outstanding characteristics of the Mormons was that they took themselves seriously. People who had been "chosen" the instruments through which the souls of the earth were to be brought to the truth had a far greater calling than even the kings, whose power at most was but temporal. This approach is undoubtedly very important in analyzing the power of the Mormon movement. Lay leadership was fully expressed from the first. Every member was a missionary. Converts were so numerous that the task of supplying trained leaders would have been hopeless even if desired. Laymen were called to office and felt themselves highly favored at the opportunity for service.

Before the movement had gone far the problem of diversion of function between layman and prophet was encountered. The first real test of the power of the prophet ended neither in the establishment of theocracy nor complete church democracy. The members voted to let the voice of the prophet, when he spoke through revel-

¹Lloyd, op. cit., pp. 57 ff.

ation, be the principal guide to the body of the church. The dangers of uncontrolled revelation in the hands of individuals became evident and resulted in its limitations.¹ In this incident there is a clear acceptance of democratic action by the people and at the same time a recognition of an authoritative revelation for church government. Since this early time these ordinarily conflicting ideas have continued to be manifest together without great friction in Latter-day Saint government.

The chief power of the first Mormon prophet seems to have been in the field of theological interpretation. There is little evidence to show that laymen did not exercise freedom in deciding for themselves matters of church government. The material increase in the prophetic prestige came largely in the later periods of church history. Among a people who exercised strong faith in the prophetic power of their leader little danger could be experienced in giving laymen high power and official offices. The organization of the quorum of the twelve apostles was perhaps the most important step in the elevation of laymen to prominent positions in the church. These apostles and also the later council of seventies retained their status as laymen and pursued their regular occupations.

Lay leadership in the Mormon movement has been a necessity as well as a matter of choice. From the first this type of leadership seems to have been taken for granted. It was not decided upon as a consciously projected plan but merely accepted as it came along. The low economic level of many of the Latter-day Saints must be kept in mind. Mormonism was truly a religion of the "disinherited," and in such circumstances lay leadership was especially desirable. It seems that a large part of the success of Latter-day Saint lay leadership lies in the fact that in general the members are not well-to-do. Their economic status keeps them, as a class, interested in service to the church. This attachment makes any program which provides for economic betterment a vital issue with church laymen. Provided with an opportunity for social expression the layman works with an alacrity found only among groups who are driving hard to satisfy fundamental human needs. When thus expressed religion takes the center of life and activity rather than becoming an ecclesiastical shell or an empty

¹Ibid., pp. 50 ff.

formality.

The Mormon Missionary System as a Device
for the Development of Lay Leadership

Lay leadership among Latter-day Saints does not necessarily imply totally untrained leadership. Although formal training in schools of divinity is practically unknown among them the Mormons have developed a means of practical training which is devoted primarily to the making of better Latter-day Saints. One of the most important agencies of this training has been the missionary system. The church furnishes no financial remuneration for the missionary and the acceptance of the mission call is motivated by considerations that are not related to immediate financial gain.

The proselyting project has been closely related to the concept of "the gathering."¹ The revelation which told of the location of the new Zion in western Missouri, as a place for the gathering of Israel, gave renewed enthusiasm to the missionary enterprise. This incident is typical of the function which was exercised by the practice of continuous revelation in providing new projects and visions for the future among a people who could really believe. And the Mormons believed. Faith was not to overcome action but to stimulate it. New revelation appeared at pivotal points and kept the Saints imbued with the magnitude of their tasks.

The mission is a practical training school for the lay leader. Until recently formal missionary training courses were not held.² The layman was taken as he was and his task in the mission field was often to learn the gospel as well as to learn to teach and preach it. After spending from two to five years in the field the missionary returned home and assumed active leadership responsibility.

The success of the church in marshaling its laymen behind the missionary program has been largely the result of the power of the "call." This device is at the center of all lay leader responsibility. The power of the "call" is, of course, dependent

¹Ibid., pp. 72-74.

²At the present time two weeks of formal training is given before the missionary goes to his field of labor.

upon the belief among church members that their officers are divinely inspired in the direction of church affairs. This is a significant factor in the promotion of the present and future lay leadership program among the Latter-day Saints.

The missionary policy of the church has undergone various phases of adjustment in response to changing needs. The general drive, however, has been constant. Church members today are beginning to recognize the limitations as well as the opportunities of their proselyting system. Changed methods and a new approach to the message are in evidence in the present program.¹

The Mormon missionary system is vital to the lay leadership program of the church in a number of ways. It involves at least three important phases, namely: the missionary as a messenger to the world, the mission as a training school for lay leaders in the church, and the proselyte as a type of the future lay leader in the church. Viewed from these angles the contribution of the missionary system to future lay leadership must depend largely upon the type and training of the missionary who goes to represent the church. If the mission were nothing more than a device for the education of prospective leaders it would be most important that these persons be carefully selected and that the mission be more than an intensive conversion experience. In the field of education the mission furnishes a prime opportunity for schooling in the presence of an on-going life situation. The elder is close to the vital issues of life and may be skillfully directed in the techniques of social control and personal religious counseling as well as in teaching and administering practical church affairs. The Mormon missionary system today is becoming more selective in its personnel and a consistent attempt at formal missionary education is in evidence.

Lay Leadership in the Various Periods of Latter-day Saint History

The activities of most religious movements have radiated from a relatively constant central location. The Mormon group has developed in a very different manner. The location of its central body has been changed five times and each of these geographical locations has left its specific contribution to the development of

¹Lloyd, op. cit., pp. 84 ff.

lay leadership.

During the history of this movement in New York its members were imbued with the spirit of democratic self-expression and the rights of the common man, a philosophy which at that time permeated the country and found its center of emphasis in central and western New York. In this new religious movement old dogmas which had stressed the punishments of God and the depravity of man were rejected in favor of doctrines which emphasized human worth and the progress of personality.

Individualism was so prominent in this period that the new movement found difficulty in maintaining a semblance of authoritative control by which the group could be held together. In the course of this first period the infant organization experienced test cases in group control. The issue was one relative to the use and correct channeling of revelation. In these incidents the central problem was that of avoiding priestcraft within the church and the outcome was a statement of policy for the division of function between the prophet and the laymen. The word of the Lord through the prophet soon became the unifying force which brought control and group solidarity. When the people voted to accept the word of the prophet as the symbol of central unity there was no thought of limiting religious democracy or lay initiative. This period witnessed the beginning of a system in which pure theocracy and democracy were to operate together. The bond of union was the faith of the member in his prophet.

From 1831-1839 church laymen directed every effort toward the establishment of Zion. Principal centers of activity were Kirtland, Ohio, and western Missouri. At this time the missionary system was given added emphasis and economic and social programs which involved a consecration of economic goods brought new lay responsibilities. Because of the fact that activity was centered on two fronts almost a thousand miles apart, the real responsibility for pioneering success rested upon the laity themselves. From governmental frictions which were in evidence between these two bodies there developed a system of general church supervision which superseded the local units. The power of the presidency and the apostles was strengthened and the procedure for authoritative succession of the church councils was determined. Each priesthood quorum could now be recognized in its proper place. Although the validity of prophetic revelation was not questioned by loyal mem-

bers the laymen retained their democratic status by initiating church projects and, on occasion, even called the prophet to account for his actions.

The development of power in the ecclesiastical councils during this period is not to be understood as a surrendering of the influence of the people. It should be remembered that the priesthood was conferred upon all worthy men of the church and their duties in church councils were performed in connection with their status as pure laymen. The Mormon group has always been opposed to a paid priesthood. In the growth of centralized government in the church it was expected that officers continue to earn a livelihood through an outside vocation. Thus the voice of the people continued to be the dominant note in church government.

Lay Leadership in Illinois

The story of the way in which the people of Illinois welcomed the Mormons, after their dramatic expulsion from Missouri, is a good study of political strategy mixed with philanthropic sentiment. The point of real interest for our purpose is that the state of Illinois provided an asylum where these exiles could renew their spirits and recognize new hopes for the building of their Zion. During this period the Latter-day Saints had the opportunity to carry on for a time an unmolested religious life during which a number of their growing theories could be put to practical use. The building of Zion went on with a temporary change in its location as the chief alteration and the missionary enterprise expanded and became better organized. Left for a few years relatively undisturbed by their enemies the Saints delegated high powers to their leaders. This increase in power of the central authority was manifest in civil as well as ecclesiastical government. The two fields of government were for a time closely interrelated with the chief power resting in the hands of the prophet-mayor.

One cannot disregard the prominence of open congregational action which accompanied the highly centralized power of this period. Although the power was almost absolute it was a willingly designated absolutism. A leader had spoken. His notes were so satisfying to his followers that they were willing to follow without question and with the hope that no cause for doubt might arise. The further development of priesthood quorums and councils was

important in the delegation of power from congregations to lay officials. The women of the church were given a place of importance almost equal to that of men, thus extending lay influence.

When, at the death of the prophet, the crisis of selecting new leadership came to the people they chose a somewhat intermediary position of government through the apostles' quorum in place of selecting a prophet leader or theocratic guide.¹ Although this left government largely in the hands of councils they were layman's councils and as such divided the new group responsibilities so that lay expression was felt in all phases of the group life.

This period clearly demonstrates the way in which the central power of the church developed as a companion of rather than in opposition to its lay leadership, and opens an era for the development of the higher councils which were so influential in the early Utah period.

From the time of the beginning of the migration to Utah the Mormon picture is greatly changed. With the realization that they had been unprotected by a country which did not accept their religious code they now could recognize but one significant loyalty. That loyalty was to their religion. Upon their arrival in the great Basin they were in no mood to question the leadership of the man who had been most instrumental in bringing them to safety. Instead of leaving Brigham Young merely as president of the twelve apostles they unanimously sustained the suggestion that he be made president of the church. Under the new conditions of pioneer life a strong hand was necessary to marshal the forces of diffusion that were operative. Brigham Young took complete charge of the situation and the church body witnessed a new era of central control. This control, however, had its roots deep in the thinking of the people who found sufficient opportunities and challenge to their individuality in the exigencies of colonizing activities and of pioneer life in general. Even though a new note of authority was struck there was also an accompanying chorus of pioneer individualism. It will be remembered that all of the leaders were laymen and were still active in their vocations. The ideal for building Zion took on new vigor and there was work for

¹Comments of the Illinois press of this period are well presented in Cecil A. Snider, A Syllabus on Mormonism in Illinois from the Angle of the Press (University of Chicago, Church Historian's Research Fund, 1936).

all.

In this period problems of group control were left more and more in the hands of the leading councils. The presidency of Brigham Young covered a period which was characterized by relative isolation of the Mormon group. He wielded an influence and power which was, for a time, appropriately theocratic. The early Utah period can be described as one in which frontier life placed its premium upon local lay initiative and leadership while at the same time authoritative control necessarily assumed the dominant place in general church affairs.

With the completion of the transcontinental railroad and the improvement in general communication Utah was no longer a separated society. New conditions were met by new leaders whose policy it was to place added responsibility upon local leaders rather than to continue to build in the direction of centralization. This program gave opportunity for a further development of initiative among the people and laid a basis for a type of individual thinking and acting which was in complete accord with the earlier Mormon pattern and without which progressive lay leadership was impossible.

Present Status of Lay Leadership Among Latter-day Saints

The practice of lay leadership is still a dominant characteristic of Latter-day Saint local government and it reaches far into the central offices of the church. This type of leadership has reached a high stage of development in the Mormon movement because of the group acceptance of a philosophy which reconciles a divinely appointed authority with the concept of religious democracy. Earlier religious movements, which have attempted to attain both of these concepts, have experienced difficulty and have found it necessary to emphasize but one of them. Mormonism up to the present time has been disinclined to drop either, and the combination has produced a unique culture which has made possible the present lay leadership program. The "call" remains today of sufficient force within the church to keep its leadership program functioning with some degree of efficiency. Laymen in large numbers rally to the service of their church and carry the burden of its government.

In this system, which depends so much upon the confidence

of its people, authority is not expressed today in coercive terms. An examination of circulars and other messages sent from presiding officials to local officers reveals that in spite of a clear and unquestioned attitude regarding the order of church government the spirit of suggestion and counseling dominates the communications in place of formalized and authoritative decrees. Affirmative responses to the requests and suggestions of officials are still relatively high. In this two contributing factors seem significant. The first is the popular concept that church leaders receive divine inspiration in the regulation of the affairs of the people. The second is the subtle and immeasurable power of social approval.

A functional analysis of the number, type, and nature of leadership positions offered to laymen in the church shows that from the time when a layman first becomes interested in the organization he is expected to carry some responsibility for its welfare. With a complete ward organization demanding a minimum of about one hundred rotating positions of leadership every available member is called to do his part. The number of ward positions increases with the growth of membership. These responsibilities range in nature from those of executive status through business and clerical work, teaching, counseling, and recreational leadership. They fall into two groups which might be represented roughly as general priesthood leadership, and leadership within the auxiliary associations.

Leadership education among the Mormons is taken care of chiefly by providing laymen with actual practice of leadership within the organization, by theological education derived from church meetings and gospel conversations, through conferences and conventions, by instructions through correspondence and publications, and by formal educational institutions such as seminaries, institutes, colleges, and the church university. A combination of these approaches works continuously throughout the week as well as on Sunday and is raising perceptibly the standard of Latter-day Saint lay leadership. The church program for week-day religious education has some unique characteristics and is becoming significant to the history of education in the United States.

When viewed in its relationship to the individual member an extensive program of lay leadership might be either beneficial or detrimental. It is self evident that lay leadership may be of

little advantage to a group unless the layman is a growing and progressive type. Latter-day Saints must face this issue squarely and recognize the advantages which might accrue from a professionally trained leadership. In its historic setting lay leadership was a prime necessity and today its advantages seem well enough established to justify its continuance. We cannot overlook the opportunity it provides for democracy in church affairs. Nor can we disregard its important place in furnishing a dominant task and purpose around which many Latter-day Saints today are finding new personal integration.

From the standpoint of the Mormon movement itself the financial advantages of lay leadership seem certain. There is at least a great saving in salaries, which can be turned toward the stabilizing of the church in other directions. Just to what extent lay leadership is effective in increasing the income of the church is yet an open question.

In its transition the leadership program faces new issues. The church meets the problem of holding its more educated laity in the line of leadership duty. Its chief emphasis in this field is an attempt to promulgate, through its system of education, a program which will provide for the preparation of leaders, and at the same time cement their loyalties to the group. Theological stress is not placed so much upon fundamentalist interpretation of doctrine as upon the practical value of the religious ideal. Mormonism has emphasized always the importance of learning and of formal education. As it now meets an educational world which is dominated by naturalistic approaches and the scientific method there is a tendency for large numbers of the educated laity to accept new interpretations of theological concepts. In a system which stresses lay leadership so much it is imperative to retain the most widely educated and best trained people so that they will be available for the high type of leadership desired.

This study has shown the way in which lay leadership and individual initiative have developed in connection with a philosophy of divinely delegated authority. This development is rooted in a time when Mormonism was a religion of the "disinherited." When the people were constantly on the move, and were losing their property with each new location lay leadership was their only choice. The new test for this type of leadership comes as Latter-day Saints develop large numbers of people who attain

high social status and financial respectability. Such conditions make new demands upon the organization. The call comes for better preaching, for more dependable local counseling, for skillfully directed church services, and for leadership in fields where secular agencies cannot compete. These demands put a special strain upon lay leadership, and if this leadership is to retain its place laymen must feel an obligation to accept types of education which will train men to carry some specific type of religious leadership in a skilled manner. The mere donation of services will not answer the need. These services must be performed with recognized efficiency if the Latter-day Saint movement is to continue its present program. There are indications that the lay leadership program is adjusting to the new demands, and that the extent to which it is falling short is at least no more conspicuous than in religious bodies which employ a professional ministry.

In summarizing the extensive lay leadership program in any church the least that can be said is that such a plan places the church in the center of its people where it can keep abreast of their needs and desires. The extent to which these needs are filled may be closely related to the degree of power which the layman holds. Lay leadership is, moreover, good insurance against the separation of the church from its people. Latter-day Saint lay leadership is a fit companion for the democratic type of government in which it grew and will flourish only to the extent that religious democracy continues to be the dominant ideal of the people.

It seems appropriate to mention a few of the more significant marginal problems which this study has met and which might form the basis of future investigations. Most of these are functional and will require for their valid description an extensive field survey. A knowledge of the educational, financial and vocational status of lay leaders in the Latter-day Saint movement would be an important index to the type of leadership being given. A knowledge of the age distribution of leaders would be of use in showing the degree to which the church is a young people's or an older people's organization. The effectiveness of missionary work in progressively preparing leaders should be measured. A functional study of the needs of rural as compared with urban communities would be helpful in the formulation of local church programs for the various types of church communities.

This study has been one of historical description. The important factors in the rise and development of lay leadership in this significant movement have been traced. The Latter-day Saint claim to distinction lies largely in the extent to which the church organization has kept in touch with the practical needs of its members. In it there could be no separation of the priest from the people because the priest has been the people. Any changes which the future may bring in this program of lay leadership will bear the flavor of the unique system developed in the first century of the Mormon movement.

